

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,270	08/19/2003	Remy Zimmermann	09623V-045300US	5170
20350 7590 12/06/2007 TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP		EXAMINER		
TWO EMBAR	CADERO CENTER	•	SURVILLO, OLEG	
EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	, · ·		2142	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/06/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action							
Before	the Filing of an Appeal Brief						

Application No.		Applicant(s)
	10/644,270	ZIMMERMANN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Oleg Survillo	2142

Advisory Action	10/644,270 ZIMMERIMANN E		I AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Oleg Survillo	2142				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 21 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). ensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee					
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da).	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi te of the final rejection, o	iate extension fee ice action, or (2) as even if timely filed,			
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of ne appeal. Since			
B. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	nsideration and/or search (see NO ow); tter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); ducing or simplifying				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.				
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	: 35 USC 112, second paragraph.					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 						
For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \(\subseteq \) will not be entered, or b) \(\subseteq \) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•					
3. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and			
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a (1).			
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control of the contr						
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by		n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:						
Clindraed Cellelucc						
•		W CALDWELL Y PATENT EXAMIA	JER			

Application No. 10/644,270

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claim 1, as proposed, now specifies that the presence of a user is determined and a status of the user is determined. Claim 11, as proposed, now specifies that the presence of a user is determined and a status of the user, when present, is determined. These newly added limitations would change the scope of the invention and would necessitate further consideration and search.

Independent claims 1 and 11, as proposed, have the limitation "beyond the presence and identity of the user" removed from the body of both claims. Such amendment to remove "beyond" language would be sufficient to overcome 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection made in the last Office action.

Objection to claim 20 is maintained since no proposed changes to claim 20 and/or arguments have been made.

Claims 4 and 12, as proposed, now specify that the user's status is updated in a buddy window. This newly added limitation would change the scope of the invention and would necessitate further consideration and search.